REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Applicants acknowledge that after review of the Appeal filed in this application, a new ground of rejection has been presented. Therefore, the Examiner has reopened prosecution of claims 1-20. Claims 1-20 are rejected under the new grounds of rejection. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by ***Jensen*** (US Pat 5,293,597). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully assert that ***Jensen*** does not teach, disclose, or suggest the multi-table access called for by claim 1 of the present invention. Claim 1 of the present invention calls for executing a software object and establishing a security level for the software object. Claim 1 also calls for performing a multi-table input/output (I/O) space access and executing a function of the object, which includes accessing at least a portion of the input/output space. In contrast to claim 1, ***Jensen*** discloses several separate processes, each performing a single-table memory access. The Examiner cited column 4, lines 5-20, of ***Jensen*** to read upon the element of establishing a security level for said software object, as called for by claim 1 of the present invention. However, ***Jensen*** simply does not disclose establishing any type of a security level for a software object. The Examiner misinterprets the privileged process (*i.e.*, process A) of ***Jensen*** to argue anticipation of the element of establishing the security level of its software object. *See* column 3, lines 50-54. ***Jensen*** merely discloses that a determination is made as to the translation and permission access for a particular virtual address. *See* column 4, lines 8-10. However, no security level for any type of a particular software object is disclosed or suggested

by ***Jensen***. Therefore, this particular element (*i.e.*, establishing a security level for a software object) of claim 1 is not taught, disclosed, or suggested by ***Jensen***.

Further, ***Jensen*** fails to disclose performing a multi-table I/O space access using at least one of the security levels. In addition to the fact that the security level called for by claim 1 of the present invention is not disclosed by ***Jensen***, this prior art also does not disclose performing a multi-table (I/O) space access. ***Jensen*** discloses three separate processes (*i.e.*, process A, process B, and process C), ***Jensen*** fails to disclose or suggest a multi-table I/O space access. In fact, it is clear from the disclosure of ***Jensen*** that each of the processes relate to a separate function in ***Jensen***, (*i.e.*, a write function, a read function and an execute function). As illustrated in Figures 2 and 5 of ***Jensen***, each process is associated with a specific virtual address, which maps to a physical address within memory. For example, process A of ***Jensen*** is associated with a virtual address 201, process B is associated with a virtual address 202, and process C is associated with a virtual address 203. *See,* Figures 2 and 5, column 3, lines 50-57 of ***Jensen***. Each process uses the virtual address to access certain physical addresses within the memory 12. However, there is no disclosure of a multi-table memory access in ***Jensen***. Each process of ***Jensen*** simply performs a *separate* single-table memory access. ***Jensen*** clearly asserts that there is no need to switch the MMU back and forth between process A, process B and process C, since only the appropriate translation tables will be used for each process. *See* column 3, lines 3-6. Therefore, ***Jensen*** asserts that each translation table is associated with *each* respective process. Hence, the various tables disclosed by ***Jensen*** simply relate to a separate table associated with each respective process. Further, ***Jensen*** affirmatively asserts that there is no multiple table access and points to a single table for each type of memory access. Accordingly, ***Jensen*** fails to disclose yet another element relating to the multi-table I/O space

access called for by claims of the present invention. Therefore, various elements of claim 1 of the present invention are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by ***Jensen*** or any cited prior art. For similar reasons, claim 8, which calls for performing a multi-table I/O space access, is not taught, disclosed, or suggested by ***Jensen***.

Claim 12 calls for an apparatus that comprises means for performing a multi-table I/O space access using at least one of a security level that may be established for said software object being executed. Therefore, as described above, ***Jensen*** does not disclose means for performing a multi-table (I/O) space access. Accordingly, claim 12 of the present invention is allowable.

Claim 13 calls for an (I/O) access interface that is coupled to a bus and a memory unit wherein the memory access interface is capable of providing a processor of a multi-level table I/O space access to access a portion of the memory unit. As described above, ***Jensen*** does not disclose the multi-level table I/O space access. Accordingly, all of the elements of claim 13 of the present invention are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by ***Jensen***. Therefore, claim 13 of the present invention is allowable. Further, claim 17 calls for a computer programmable device encoded with instructions which, when executed by a computer, performs a method that includes performing a multi-table I/O space access, which for at least the reasons cited above, is not taught disclosed or suggested by ***Jensen***. Therefore, claim 17 of the present invention is allowable.

Independent claims 1, 12, and 13 are allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Additionally, dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 14-16, and 18-20, which respectively depend from claims 1, 8, 12, 13, and 17, are also allowable for at least the reasons cited above.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. In light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-20 are allowable. In light of the arguments presented above, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, **the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4069** to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: November 8, 2006

By: /Jaison C. John/
Jaison C. John, Reg. No. 50,737
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-7000
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)